

The Leesburg Planning Commission met on Thursday, February 3, 2005 in the Council Chambers, 25 West Market Street, Leesburg, Virginia. Staff members present were Wade Burkholder, Brian Boucher, Christopher Murphy, Susan Swift, Mac Willingham, David Fuller, Bruce Douglas, Steve McGreggor, Nick Colonna, and Linda DeFranco.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by Chairman Vaughan.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL**

Present: Chairman Vaughan  
Commissioner Bangert  
Commissioner Barnes  
Commissioner Hoovler  
Commissioner Jones  
Commissioner Wright

Absent: Commissioner Kalriess

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Commissioner Bangert moved to adopt the agenda as presented.

Motion: Bangert  
Second: Barnes  
Carried: 5-0

Commissioner Jones was not present during this vote.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Commissioner Wright requested that the two sets of minutes be considered separately.

Commissioner Hoovler moved to adopt the minutes of the January 20, 2005 meeting as presented.

Motion: Hoovler  
Second: Wright  
Carried: 5-0

Commissioner Bangert moved to adopt the minutes of the February 3, 2005 meeting as presented:

Motion:        Bangert  
Second:        Hoovler  
Carried:        4-0-1

Commissioner Wright abstained from this set of minutes because he was not at the meeting.

Commissioner Jones was not present for the vote on the minutes.

**PREVIEW CASES**

None

**CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT**

Chairman Vaughan reviewed the remainder of the agenda for the members of the public.

**PETITIONERS**

None

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**TLZM 2004-0006 – Kincaid Forest Concept Plan Amendment, Southwest Corner of Battlefield Parkway and Kincaid Forest Boulevard** – Wade Burkholder, AICP, Planner.

David Jordan, representative for the applicant, gave a background on the proposed development. Essentially the plan calls for 38 townhouses on land that is currently zoned for commercial/office use. A quarter mile of Battlefield Parkway would be completed by the developer as a result of this project. The current Town Plan indicates that completion of Battlefield Parkway is a top priority for the town. The fact that there have been no applications for this land, has allowed this area to become a dumping ground. This has resulted in the erosion of the intended tax and employment base for this area. Residential development will generate revenue. The zoning proposed for this site was accessory retail, not vital retail or commercial. Because of the slope on this land, a grouping of townhouses would have less impact on runoff than commercial development because of the ability to step the design. This use would bring the road improvement needed for the area and would reduce potential negative impact to the environment and bring in needed tax base.

Wade Burkholder presented the staff report. He pointed out that the land was zoned PRN in 1990 with this site set aside for retail/office/commercial use. This application would proffer two northbound lanes of Battlefield Parkway along frontage of Section 8 along with two off-site northbound lanes of the Parkway within the existing right of way from Tavistock Drive to the southern boundary of Section 8, Kincaid Forest. The proposed use does comply with the town plan range of residential mix with regard to dwelling units per acre, but not with the proposed use of this parcel. Fiscal impact needs to be taken into consideration for this application. The environmental impact also needs to be addressed. Adding an escalator clause to bring the monetary impact of this proposal to 2005 rates is also encouraged. Based on the compliance with the 1997 Town Plan, staff recommends denial of this development proposal.

At this time the meeting was turned over to the public hearing.

Dan Maticic of 955 Rhonda Place came forward as the Vice President of the Homeowners Association in this area. He stated that they are in favor of the proposed development.

Virginia McGuire of 901 Rhonda Place favors the new proposal over the commercial plan. She was afraid of increased traffic if this was developed commercially. Since this parcel is adjacent to the recreation center, there would be many children impacted by the increased traffic. Also, they would like to see the tree stand saved, and the retail plan would result in the loss of many of the trees.

Sandy Kane of Kenneth Place came forward to support the townhouse development. She felt this would bring harmony to the neighborhood. Currently the condition of the area is an unfinished plan of action. With a major roadway proposed to cut through the area, adding to the traffic through commercial use does not seem wise. The first developer left with no plantings that were proposed thus shortchanging the community. Leaving the property commercial and building a mini strip mall in the area serves no purpose to the community. The townhouse proposal will allow more greenspace.

At this time the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Jones asked Wade Burkholder about the bonding procedure and whether the bonding was inadequate in Kincaid Forest with the previous developer. He went on to ask if the roadways weren't required vs. just being proffered. Mr. Burkholder said the portion of Battlefield Parkway is required to be built out upon development of this section. In using the density calculations, he is using the entire development rather than just this area. Does it have to be done this way? Mr. Burkholder responded that this was the process.

Commissioner Jones asked Mr. Jordan where the tree save area was in this 6.3 acres. Mr. Jordan replied it is along Kincaid Boulevard and results in about one acre of trees.

Mayor Umstattd said she was unclear on how many feet of Battlefield Parkway is being proposed to be built, both onsite and offsite. The actual linear footage is 1390 feet. The offsite is 900 feet and onsite is 490 feet. A monetary value of around \$650,000 is anticipated, although the Engineering department estimated the figure to be higher.

Commissioner Wright asked if they were seeking greater density bonus than they already have. Mr. Burkholder responded that they are asking for twenty additional bonus units. Mr. Wright asked if staff agreed with this request. Mr. Burkholder said they can go up to the maximum allowable under the current town plan. Mr. Wright went on to ask about the Fiscal Impact Study and how it relates to the 60/40 study. What are the miscellaneous revenues? Mr. Jordan couldn't specifically answer, but said that 38 townhouses would not have significant impact on schools or town services, but said they would provide more specific numbers. The analysis that was done was only on town taxes, not county.

Commissioner Wright asked if the commercial aspect of this parcel was marketed and failed to draw interest. Mr. Jordan said that none of the commercial parcels in the area are moving, currently there is no interest. Mr. Wright went on to ask how much grading would be required to prepare this steeply terrained parcel for building. Mr. Jordan responded that it would be about 8-10 feet of fill. The townhouses can be scaled up the grade, so this type of use can take advantage of the grade. The commercial use would present more of a problem. They are trying to save some trees and develop a trail, however the police department discouraged this saying it was a dangerous idea to have the trail run through the trees. Lastly, Mr. Wright asked about the drainage in the area after the grading is completed, since the townhouses will be below grade. Mr. Jordan responded that the drainage concerns will be addressed.

Brian Boucher spoke with respect to the commercial areas in the area. There is interest, but in some instances road improvements need to be considered prior to promotion of potential commercial development.

Commissioner Bangert has some concerns that Arcadia doesn't have to build their portion of Battlefield Parkway. Brian Boucher said it was not part of the proffer agreement at that time. Ms. Bangert asked what the timing of the construction of the parkway is and how much the total cost is at present. Mac Willingham said it was about 2009/2010 for beginning construction. In response to Mr. Jones, the bonding in the original part of Kincaid Forest was with a Savings and Loan that went bankrupt. The frontage improvements on Tavistock are built on the back side and actually front on Beauregard. Further Ms. Bangert asked about school impact, Tavistock 107 units coming on line, Stratford has many units coming in and how close are we to capacity at Cool Spring Elementary School. Currently estimates are 1.2 children per townhouse which would add 45 more students. Consideration must be taken to assure that decisions are made based on the entire picture.

Commissioner Barnes said he would support this project if it were an adult community. He asked what the per child cost was for schooling. The figure is around \$20,038. With

38 three bedroom townhouses going in, he estimated 76 children x \$20,038 which totals over \$1,500,000.

Wade Burkholder said that the capacity at Cool Springs Elementary is 704 and in the fall of 2004 was at 703. It's at max.

Mr. Barnes went on to say that all of the commercial and residential should be built together so that this situation doesn't occur again.

Commissioner Jones said that the county has passed something that charges each unit for school impact up to a certain amount. Commissioner Bangert said it was around \$37,000 per unit. Mr. Jones asked if we shouldn't consider something like this. Commissioner Bangert said that this had passed at the county level, and now she can bring this forward to this Commission if they are ready to discuss it.

Mr. Jordan commented that the impact fee will affect proffer tradeoffs. He went on to say that they used the County number of average number of children per townhouse to arrive at their numbers. Currently, the Commission is focusing on one school, keep in mind that they will also affect middle and high schools.

Chairman Vaughan asked if they were willing to contribute to the school system for the impact. Mr. Jordan replied that they contribute to parks, police, fire and \$700,000 for roads. Taxes from the townhouses would go to the school system. He would need to check with Mr. Lester. Mr. Vaughan went on to say that these things all need to be addressed. His concern with the project is that it violates the Town Plan. In the rewrite of the town plan, they need to put a trigger into commercial, there needs to be a curb on residential development. There are too many rooftops, commercial seems to be a better use of the land. Mr. Jordan responded that he understands the concerns for the town plan, but feels that there are commercial areas better suited for this type of development.

Mr. Maticic said that the residents of the area do not want any commercial development in the area, they want all of it to be residential. They feel that they can go into town to get anything they need.

Chairman Vaughan asked Mr. Burkholder what the comment was on the open space requirement of this development. Mr. Burkholder replied that the developer has complied with all open space requirements.

Commissioner Wright said he doesn't know how anything can be built on that site, it is best suited for open space. The commercial proposal wouldn't work well. He said that the community definitely is clear on what they want in the area.

Commissioner Jones had a concern about the walkway that was to go through the woods. Mr. Jordan said this is now along the right of way. Mr. Jones hopes that the location of the walkway can be reconsidered. Use the natural features to accommodate the sense of community.

Chairman Vaughan asked if there were any other questions and at this time announced that the public hearing would remain open for the next ten days. The next action will take place at the March 3 Planning Commission meeting.

**SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT**

None

**ZONING**

**Fort Evans Plaza II (International Pavilion)**

**TLSE-2004-0013 Retail Center greater than 100,000 square feet**

**Situated at the northwest corner of Fort Evans Road and planned Battlefield Parkway, NE.**

**TLSE-2004-0014 Bank with Drive-Through, North**

**Situated at the northwest corner of Fort Evans Road and planned Battlefield Parkway, NE.**

**TLSE-2004-0015 Bank with Drive-Through, South**

**Situated at the northwest corner of Fort Evans Road and planned Battlefield Parkway, NE.**

**TLSE-2004-0016 Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Through**

**Situated at the northwest corner of Fort Evans Road and planned Battlefield Parkway, NE.**

Christopher Murphy, AICP, Sr. Planner

Mike Collier of Uniwest came forward to provide more information on their project. He addressed Rehau's concern regarding their access and the berm/buffer around their property. They will meet their request. Impact on Ft. Evans Road will be somewhat minimized because the fast food restaurant plan has been withdrawn, and the applicant has made other changes in the plan. They combined two buildings into one, consolidating the loading areas and dumpster areas. They also rotated the bank on the corner so that the drive through is in the back of the project. Head-in parking has been eliminated in the area facing Ft Evans Road. They have extended the screening the entire width of the parcel containing the bank, which will be a stone wall rather than a hedge. Staff has now received the dumpster locations and photometrics for the entire site. They have a lighting consultant reviewing the location and height of the poles. They have reduced the size of the building near the Civil War mounds and are planning to put a wrought iron fence and some plaques there to memorialize the site. The building nearest it has been now set aside as a restaurant with a patio area facing this Civil War site. Some parking spaces have been eliminated to expand on the green space. The architecture of the two larger buildings has changed somewhat by reducing the tower height and removing some of the lighting. He stressed that the quality of the site is high and it will include pedestrian scale and compatibility. The entranceway will have a pond

and retaining wall as a background. He stressed that as people drive by this site, they will see the stone retaining walls and greenspace, not buildings and parking lots.

Commissioner Barnes asked Mr. Murphy if he was receptive to the new plans and what recommendation he had. Mr. Murphy responded there were still several aspects of the plan to consider, but that the next staff report will cover these.

Commissioner Bangert said she did not see a setback for parking on the west side of the plan. Mr. Murphy said there was a setback, although it didn't look like it on this plan. It is a minimal setback of 10 feet. Ms. Bangert went on to ask if they had addressed the possibility of a church building on the other side of Battlefield Parkway and this would impact the curb cuts. Mike Banzhaf said their access arrangements have been taken into consideration and they will work together on this. Ms. Bangert said the size of the two larger buildings will have immense visual impact on the area, making it almost look like a strip mall with columns. She asked if the buildings could be rotated in such a way that would minimize the frontage visual and utilize some of the rear of the building area for parking. Mr. Collier said this is not the same scale at the Target and Costco. The L shape rotation of the building would then expose the backside of the building. Ms. Bangert said that having access and parking on both sides of the stores is very helpful. Hiding loading spaces and putting electrical accesses on the roof help the appearance. Mr. Collier commented that many businesses will not operate with the entrances on both sides of the building.

Commissioner Wright asked what the clock was on this for public hearing. Mr. Murphy said there was no pressing clock and that the timeframe can be up to a year. He said it would be best to vote at the next meeting because of workload. Mr. Wright then asked what the timeframe was for completion of the parkway. Mac Willingham said he would look into that.

Mayor Umstattd said this portion of the Parkway was currently inactive, much of it is private property and the funding is not available. The Mayor went on to suggest that the Commission be given a copy of the packet that Council took to Richmond. This provides timeframes and funding scenarios for various road projects.

Commissioner Wright said that this is supposed to be a destination site, however there is no office space dedicated to this site. Why not? Mr. Collier responded that there is an office building proposed. They do have a brokerage firm that markets commercial and office space, and currently the market does not indicate much interest in office space. What is zoned retail is currently raising interest, therefore it's driving development. Mr. Wright went on to discuss the by right use of the 100,000 square feet of retail and how does the property split into parcels to include the by right. Mike Banzhaf pointed out on the map how this split out.

Mayor Umstattd said she was happy to see a pond and would like to see a fountain added. She then asked how the hedgerow would look as a hedge instead of a wall. Mr. Collier

said there will be plantings in the buffer area between the road and the wall. He went on to say that hedges collect debris and the plants can die.

Commissioner Hoovler said he was encouraged with the changes in the plan. He would like to see more mixed use and increase in office space although he doesn't know the economics of it. Another concern was lighting, the height of the poles, etc. He would like to see lower poles in front of the buildings. Mr. Collier said there would be some 20' poles in some areas, and then 33' poles in other areas. Mr. Hoovler asked about the tree save area and what was being done to reduce the impervious surface. Lastly how many retail units will be in each building. Mr. Collier responded there would be three midsize stores in each building with small shops to kind of pull the two buildings together. There was some further discussion on the number of parking spaces and the current plan shows a surplus of parking spaces. Mr. Hoovler asked Mr. Collier to consider reducing parking and increasing tree save areas. Mr. Collier said a fully engineered plan will result in a reduction in the number of spaces.

Commissioner Jones was pleased with the look of the new plan. He liked the pedestrian treatment. He referred to the Town Plan with regard to the non historic district that suggests that architecture reflect the town's character while maintaining functionality. He stressed that Leesburg has a character and he feels that this plan reflects more of an art deco, southern Asian feel. Can the applicant make an effort to bring the building profiles more into concert with Leesburg's architecture. Mr. Collier replied that they would readdress the look of the architecture. Mr. Jones said he would support this application if it had a different look and if they considered putting in more office space.

Chairman Vaughan asked about the Rehau easement and whether they were satisfied with its location. Mr. Collier said this had been resolved. He then went on to request that the applicant consider 20' light poles rather than the 33' poles. He also stressed the need to incorporate more office space. Mr. Collier said there will be some small offices for uses by such tenants as doctors, insurance agencies, etc. Mr. Vaughan also asked that they consider reducing the amount of impervious surface in this application, saying that he favored the use of parking structures.

Paul Rainard of the Sycolin Hills Homeowners Association came forward and said he was impressed with the design, but had some concern about the road system in the area. Mainly the fact that four lanes go to two lanes and then back to four lanes. This area is already very congested and this does not seem like a good idea. Mike Banzhaf said the road would be four lanes all the way to Festival Lakes.

Mayor Umstattd mentioned funds that the county has for a traffic signal and asked Mr. Banzhaf to investigate the use of these.

Chairman Vaughan summarized the comments and issues that are still of concern and moved on to the Comprehensive Planning portion of the agenda.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING**

David Fuller, Chief of Comprehensive Planning discussed the meeting schedule for discussion of the draft town plan with the various commissions including the Economic Development, Environmental Advisory, Residential Traffic, Airport, Tree and Parks and Recreation Commissions and the Board of Architectural Review. Tonight the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation, Heritage Resources and Community Design elements will be presented. Mr. Fuller explained how data was gathered, through auditing the 1997 Town Plan, and public meetings which included five sector meetings and 5 visioning meetings. These meetings were open to the general public and gathered information and ideas from the citizens. Then there were joint meetings with various commissions and the Town Council and there was interdepartmental review by the Town Plan Coordinating Committee. This Committee consists of representatives from the various departments within the town government. Following these exercises, nine background reports were prepared and presented.

The draft Town Plan is broken into the introduction, elements, policy maps, the action program and finally transportation costs. The draft builds upon previous concepts, focuses on policy, integrates the various elements, focuses on implementation and has geographic specificity.

The Natural Resources element was presented by Bruce Douglas, Senior Planner. Mr. Douglas began by commenting on the previous case on Ft. Evans Plaza. He said that this was a perfect example of utilizing a town plan. There are clearly three choices, one to ignore the plan, one to deny the application and lastly working in concert with the applicant to create a development that conforms with the town plan while creating a product that serves everyone's purpose.

Natural Resources are a specific use of land. Designing with nature by setting the boundary between open space and buildable land. Creating the green infrastructure in Leesburg can be accomplished by maintaining the flora and fauna along with preserving stream corridors and carefully planning the land use. Such efforts as re-establishing the tree canopy, minimizing adverse impacts of human activities and implementing building and site design to conserve energy and minimize air quality degradation are important to the preservation of natural resources. All of these efforts require an environmental assessment procedure for all new development. Standards to assess progress, revision of ordinances and policies and implementation will help to achieve these goals.

Chairman Vaughan said that each of the objectives would be taken separately and commented on.

Commissioner Bangert suggested that terminology on page NR-2 be changed to clarify the meaning of the sentence. She then asked how stream corridors could be restored if they are already built on. Mr. Douglas said that it could be done very slowly and carefully and not all of the corridor might be able to be repaired.

Commissioner Hoovler also commented on Page NR-2, asking what a geotechnical hazard was. Mr. Douglas said they are sinkholes, etc. Mr. Hoovler asked that examples be used to help define some of the technical terms.

Commissioner Jones said that on Page NR-1, he feels that the section was weakened by referring to only new and redevelopment. He felt this should be changed. On page NR-3, he commented that there is no longer any water discharge into Tuscarora Creek and has not been for some time, so reference to this needs to be removed. On page NR-4 he changed the word appropriated to “appropriate”. On NR-5, the whole plan basis on Natural Resources should be the watershed, not stream valleys. Evaluate where the watersheds are and measure what is happening from the top to the bottom, not just adjacent segments and/or water quality.

Commissioner Bangert commented on Objective No. 2 as follows. We currently have a River and Stream Corridor Overlay, correct? Mr. Douglas referred to this as a Creek Valley Buffer but is the same concept. Ms. Bangert asked if this needed to be extended further out. Mr. Douglas said that this was part of the implementation. She then asked the definition of an unavoidable obtrusion. Mr. Douglas said it could be a road, utility, dock, boat ramp, etc.

Mayor Umstattd asked how this section applied to the rip rap that was placed on Tuscarora Creek. Mr. Douglas said that this was an engineering question but should be applied with a more sensitive application.

Commissioner Bangert commented on Objective 3. Can we say that developers can’t come in and clear cut their property? Not directly. Can we put in “trees of a certain diameter”? Mr. Douglas replied that there were ways that this might be incorporated, one of which is a tree canopy requirement. Open space requirements can be directly related to the zoning of the area. Ms. Bangert asked if this was incorporated as an objective. Mr. Douglas said that this would be an action item.

Commissioner Hoovler asked what ecologically valuable land was and where would this apply within the town of Leesburg. Mr. Douglas said this basically would apply to the UGA.

Commissioner Jones asked if the cluster ordinance was going to be revisited. He feels that is the mechanism that could help the environmental assessment.

Chairman Vaughan again stated that he feels very strongly about structured parking. This would assist in maintaining open space. He asked if this would be part of the plan. Susan Swift commented that this might be better served in the Community Design or Land Use elements. Mr. Douglas said it would fit in this element also.

Commissioner Wright asked if we needed to specifically state that there is a program for replacement of large trees and canopy restoration. Mr. Douglas said the plan is that most of the town will be developed, there will not be much natural forest left. This objective is

adjunct to objective one. Land adjacent to water resources is the most likely to have tree save and tree planting areas. Mr. Wright mentioned that there are HOAs that prohibit tree planting, and asked if we could reverse this and have the HOAs encourage planting of trees and shrubs.

Commissioner Hoovler asked that a comment be put into the plan to preserve trees where we can. He also asked how the Urban Forestry Master Plan will fit into this objective. Implementing a good tree inventory is also important. Susan Swift said that it was possible to designate historic trees which would piecemeal preservation of some of our larger trees. Mr. Hoovler asked that preservation and maintaining an inventory of trees be emphasized

Commissioner Jones said we are saying nice things about the tree canopy but that not much is being done for it. He also said that there must be a provision for maintaining the canopy and there must be a commitment to do it.

Commissioner Hoovler said perhaps this could be done in concert with CIP projects.

Mayor Umstattd would like to see a requirement that all new streets that have more than two lanes put in a tree plant median. Susan Swift said that would be nice, but the engineering side of this would say that this was impractical for every road.

Objective 5 asks for protection of the town's water resources from the impacts of non-point source pollution.

Commissioner Bangert asked if meeting the NPDES requirements or standards are an action item to go with this? Yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Hoovler asked how we could take any action on asking application of fertilizers, etc. Mr. Douglas said this would be difficult, but could be achieved through education. Also, large green areas such as golf courses, etc. could be asked to comply.

Commissioner Jones asked what impact the NPDES had on the town? Do we actually do things or do we just say we are complying? Mr. Douglas said there are many things that take place to comply, such as our wastewater plant, etc. Mr. Jones asked if it wouldn't be easier to comply if we could actually show the impacts and measurements? Mr. Douglas said that is what the watershed study will do.

Chairman Vaughan asked that the reference to water discharge into Tuscarora Creek be removed from this element immediately.

Generally the Commissioners felt that there should be mention about the product the town produces at the wastewater treatment plant that reduces pollution and produces a natural fertilizer.

Objective 6 deals with energy savings and air quality through site design, buildings and land use planning.

Commissioner Bangert asked if 6c was actually being implemented. Is this a realistic practice? Mr. Douglas said this is still innovative.

Mayor Umstattd asked why this couldn't be addressed in the zoning ordinance. Perhaps any parking garage that put a room garden on it would be considered by right.

Objective 7 deals with outdoor lighting.

Commissioner Bangert said there were other issues involved with this so care should be taken in addressing this. Many people rely on good lighting around their homes and in parking areas. What is ideal and what is reality could be touchy.

Chairman Jones said that updating the lighting technology and making it consistent could help.

Chairman Vaughan referred back to objective 6 and asked if the metrorail would be extended to Leesburg. Is this a future vision? Susan Swift said this has been mentioned, but we have no idea what the timing is. Basically when the Plan mentions transit, it is referring to busses.

Objective 8 deals with protecting people from highway and aircraft noise.

Commissioner Barnes asked how this could be done? There is no way to protect people from aircraft noise.

Commissioner Wright asked why highway noise level was higher. Mr. Douglas explained the noise source from highways comes from a horizontal direction while the aircraft noise is vertical. Berms can mitigate highway noise, but not aircraft noise.

Mayor Umstattd said that this means that there should always be enough land left around a development to put in a berm or noise wall, correct? Mr. Douglas said that this would be a decision of the town, that there were only a few roads that would require this.

There were no further comments on the remaining objectives.

Bruce Douglas, Senior Planner then gave a presentation on the Parks and Recreation element of the Draft Town Plan. Basically this element supports the goals of the Comprehensive 20-year Parks and Recreation Open Space, Trails and Greenways Master Plan. This element encourages a town wide park system that is environmentally sound. It will support creation of open space, expansion of trails, protect greenways and distribute facilities evenly.

Chairman Vaughan said that since this is a brief report, all objectives would be discussed together.

Commissioner Bangert asked if there were policies that weren't applicable to the master plan. Mr. Douglas said that the master plan was the dominant plan for this area.

Mayor Umstattd mentioned financial implications on any policies. She mentioned the current park spending and said that there weren't any available funds for purchase of new parkland.

Commissioner Bangert asked if maybe we should be more ambitious if obtaining greenspace from developers.

Commissioner Hoovler said there was no mention about the Westpark golf club and said this should be preserved as open space. Possibly this could eventually become a city owned venue. Also, under Objective 1, it should say something about working with developers to create additional open space.

Commissioner Jones said the golf club should be detailed on the land use map. Mr. Douglas said this was private land so wasn't indicated. Mr. Jones said if this is not indicated as open space, then a rezoning could come in and ask for a different use. There should be a zoning classification for this type of property. Susan Swift said if you limit it to only parkland, then what would the other use be? How can we say we don't want you to develop it, we don't want to buy it, so you need to wait. It doesn't work that way. Mr. Jones asked what the status of Balls Bluff was at this time. Has it been turned over to the Park Authority. Mayor Umstattd replied that part of it had been turned over to them.

Chairman Vaughan asked if Objective 1 will encourage the town to look for parkland in the applications. Commissioner Bangert asked if there are standards for this, e.g., per 100 houses, we would like a certain amount of land for recreational purposes. Susan Swift said there is a standard now, but it needs some revision.

Commissioner Hoovler asked if the space requirement has clear definition. Susan Swift said yes, it is defined.

Clare Deangioletti asked if there would be public input on the parks and recreation element this evening. She has asked if the Symington funds were going to be addressed and if the Paxton site would be part of the plan.

Susan Swift said they would not be specifically addressed since these were funding issues.

Steve McGregor addressed the Heritage Resources element. The town has identified its' major heritage resources, the old and historic district, individual landmarks outside the H-1 district, the H-2 corridor overlay and a variety of archaeological resources within the town and the UGA. Objectives include expanding the H-1 boundaries, including

individual sites that have been surveyed into the H-1 and identifying and surveying additional sites for H-1 designation. The action program includes designating new H-2 overlay districts, widening the the existing H-2 corridors for King and Market Streets, designating the W&OD trail as an H-2 corridor approach to town, keeping design guidelines in both districts updated and finding additional policy and code means for protecting archaeological resources.

Commissioner Wright was pleased to see the section on widening the H-2 corridors for King and Market Streets.

Mayor Umstattd asked is the town had any enforcement authority to protect archaeological resources. She referred to the Arcadia site where there was a tradeoff to preserve a site. Mr. McGregor said inclusion into historic districts would be one way. Mayor Umstattd said even with Paxton, they can only save the house for a year and after than there is no authority left. Susan Swift said any historic designation has its risk, however if things are documented and put on notice it makes it easier to make people work around them. To date we have had to work in a reactive mode. The Mayor asked if every civil war entrenchment found will have a historic overlay put on it? Ms. Swift said, no, basically some have been identified as more valuable than others. Those may have the designation put on them if it is feasible. Chairman Vaughan asked how old a property had to be before it is considered historic. Mr. McGregor responded it is at least fifty years.

Commissioner Hoovler asked if this element had been renamed. The response was, yes, it has. He commented previously that he would like to see cultural resources expanded to include the arts, outside venues for festivals, concerts, museums, etc. He feels very strongly that this needs to be included in the town plan somewhere.

Commissioner Bangert said she received notification that there were archaeological findings in Phase I of Sycolin Road. This will likely delay the road improvements.

Commissioner Hoovler asked for a definition of the objective that says "Establish a five year priority list to consider designation of architecture and architectural resources." He asked that this statement be clarified. He would also like to make it clear to developers that the town will work with them to incorporate historic focal points into their developments.

The Community Design element was presented by Steve McGregor, Planner. The goal of this element is to keep the town attractive and functional. Primarily how development functions within sites, between adjacent sites and the need to keep the building heights in line to make development compatible with the town's character. Incorporating design principles that consider human scale, mixed use patterns, pedestrian orientation, streetscape treatment and public spaces is important. The action program would like to incorporate neo-traditional design elements into the various codes and apply design guidelines to both public and private facilities in the development review process.

Commissioner Bangert liked the objective to establish distance guidelines for walkable streets, blocks and pad sites. In the objective of planning development to be compatible with the existing area might be bad, if the surrounding area is bad. She was pleased with the objective to maintain a working relationship with the County and other agencies to ensure appropriate design of their facilities.

Commissioner Wright felt that objective 1e was not stated strong enough. This objective deals with the design development on high points in town.

Commissioner Hoovler would like to see more verbiage added to Objective 4, perhaps establishing some type of body to work in concert with the County in the form of a joint commission.

Commissioner Jones agreed with the traditional design concept and said the town should stand behind the concept. With regard to the objective that ensures capital improvements are sensitive to their context, especially in older residential areas.

Commissioner Vaughan stated they should make sure that the development is properly sized to the site. He also stressed that safety issues must be put in as an objective. Perhaps there should be minimum lot sizes for certain uses such as fast food restaurants.

Commissioner Bangert referred to page 5 of the Introduction in the first full paragraph, the word now should be changed to nor. Also with reference to the water and sewer master plan, there should be a statement that says LCSA might also be a supplier of water in the JLMA.

Chairman Vaughan asked if the Commission would like to eliminate Item 13, Council and Representatives reports. Mayor Umstattd supported elimination. Item 14, Staff and Committee Reports, was also eliminated from the agenda.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Susan Swift passed out a new draft calendar on the Town Plan meeting schedule. She cautioned that this has not been approved by Council yet, so it is still a draft. There was a question regarding February 24<sup>th</sup> and why that meeting was eliminated. Ms. Swift said there was a joint Town Council/Board of Supervisors meeting that evening, so she didn't want to conflict. March 17 there will be a public hearing on Meadowbrook, so holding a meeting on the Town Plan would not be wise. The March 31<sup>st</sup> meeting is cancelled because the staff needs time to make the changes for the next presentations of the Plan.

Commissioner Jones suggested that the subcommittee appointed to meet with the County Commissioners have a meeting. It is important that they meet prior to their first meeting with the County. Chairman Vaughan agreed and said he will set a meeting time and place.

Commissioner Bangert asked that the times for the Crescent District and other meetings be put on this calendar. Susan Swift said that once the details are finalized, they would be included. She asked that the following also be included: Crosstrails on March 17<sup>th</sup> at 6:00pm, Creekside on March 31<sup>st</sup> at 7:00. The applicant has also scheduled public meetings as follows: March 23, 7:00pm at Heritage High, Crosstrails; and March 30 at 7:00pm in Harper Park middle school.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The motion was made and seconded to adjourn at 12:15pm.

**Prepared by:**

**Approved by:**

---

**Linda DeFranco, Commission Clerk**

---

**Clifton Vaughan, Chairman**